

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office action mailed February 22, 2008. Reexamination and reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 9-22, 24, and 29-40 are now pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 21 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 13, 15-21, 24, 32, 33, and 35-40 have been amended, and Claims 3, 5-8, 23, 25-28, and 41-44 are canceled. No new matter is believed to have been entered.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Office action alleges that the recitation of changing the relative size of the selected zoom point is not described.

In response, Applicants have amended the claims, as appropriate, to more accurately indicate that it is the relative size of the displayed image that is being changed, and not the relative size of the zoom point. The as-filed application, including both the description and drawings, fully support this claim language.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The claims were additionally rejected as being indefinite. Specifically, it is alleged that Applicant has not defined the recited “image edge point,” and that the selected zoom point and central point should be distinctly claimed.

In response, Applicant submits that the definition for the image edge point is clearly, definitely, and distinctly clear from both the claims and the description. In particular, paragraph [0031] on page 8 clearly states that “the displayed image 204 includes an image edge point 508 that coincides with the display area edge point 506,” and each of the independent claims definitely and distinctly points this out.

Regarding the point about the selected zoom point and the central point, it appears that there was some potential ambiguity regarding the case where the selected zoom point was coincident with the central point. As such, Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite the features of as-filed Claims 3 and 23 to more clearly point out the differences between these points.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, second paragraph rejections is requested.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1 and 21 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims and because each recite features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

Hence, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: April 7, 2008

By: /PAUL D. AMROZOWICZ, REG. NO. 45264/
Paul D. Amrozowicz
(480) 385-5060